

Daniel C. Barr (#010149)
Barry G. Stratford (#029923)
Randal B. McDonald (#032008)
Katherine E. May (#032335)
PERKINS COIE LLP
2901 North Central Avenue, Suite 2000
Phoenix, AZ 85012-2788
602-351-8000
DBarr@perkinscoie.com
BStratford@perkinscoie.com
RMcDonald@perkinscoie.com
KMay@perkinscoie.com
DocketPHX@perkinscoie.com

Julie Wilensky*
Asaf Orr*
NATIONAL CENTER FOR LESBIAN RIGHTS
870 Market Street, Suite 370
San Francisco, CA 94102
415-392-6257
jwilensky@nclrights.org
aorr@nclrights.org

Puneet Cheema*
**LAMBDA LEGAL DEFENSE AND
EDUCATION FUND, INC.**
1776 K Street N.W., Suite 722
Washington, DC 20006
202-492-7948
pcheema@lambdalegal.org

Attorneys for Plaintiffs (additional counsel listed on following page)

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

Equality Arizona; and S.C., by their mother and next friend Carol Brochin;

No.

Plaintiffs,
v.

COMPLAINT FOR INJUNCTIVE AND DECLARATORY RELIEF

Kathy Hoffman, in her official capacity as Arizona Superintendent of Public Instruction; Lucas Narducci, Daniel P. Corr, Calvin Baker, Jill Broussard, Christine Burton, Rita H. Cheng, Michele Kaye, Janice Mak, Armando Ruiz, and Patricia Welborn, each in his or her official capacity as a member of the Arizona State Board of Education.

Defendants.

1 Peter C. Renn*
2 **LAMBDA LEGAL DEFENSE AND
EDUCATION FUND, INC.**
3 4221 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 280
4 Los Angeles, CA 90010
5 213-382-7600
6 prenn@lambdalegal.org

7 Clifford Rosky*
8 383 South University Street
9 Salt Lake City, UT 84112
10 801-581-7352
11 clifford.rosky@gmail.com

12 *Attorneys for Plaintiffs*

13 *Pro hac vice application forthcoming

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

INTRODUCTION

1. This action seeks to enjoin enforcement of a facially discriminatory and harmful Arizona statute, A.R.S. § 15-716(C), which prohibits instruction that “[p]romotes a homosexual life-style” or “[p]ortrays homosexuality as a positive alternative life-style” in public school curriculum on HIV/AIDS. That prohibition violates the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution by singling out a class of students who are not heterosexual—including those who are lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender,¹ or queer (LGBTQ)—for negative treatment based on their sexual orientation, without imposing any comparable restriction on instruction about heterosexual people.

2. By classifying on the basis of “homosexuality,” the challenged statute (the “Anti-LGBTQ Curriculum Law”) facially discriminates against non-heterosexual students on the basis of sexual orientation and places them in an expressly disfavored class. The negative impact is significant, communicating to teachers and students that there is something so undesirable, shameful, or controversial about “homosexuality” that any positive portrayal of non-heterosexual people or relationships must be barred. The Anti-LGBTQ Curriculum Law also forbids medically accurate instruction that “[s]uggests that some methods of sex are safe methods of homosexual sex.” A.R.S. § 15-716(C). By forbidding the presentation of medically accurate, age-appropriate information critical for the health and safety of LGBTQ students, without imposing any comparable restriction on information about heterosexual people, the law deprives LGBTQ students of equal educational opportunities and exacerbates the heightened health risks LGBTQ students already face, including the risk of HIV.

3. Arizona schools are not safe for most LGBTQ students. Nearly 80% of LGBTQ students surveyed in Arizona regularly heard homophobic remarks, and 71% experienced verbal harassment in the past year due to their sexual orientation. Research

¹ Although transgender people, like people who are not transgender, can have any sexual orientation, there is a significant overlap among transgender people and lesbian, gay, bisexual and queer people. In addition, A.R.S. § 15-716(C) has been interpreted by some educators to prohibit discussion of transgender people.

1 shows that laws prohibiting the expression of positive views about “homosexuality” in
 2 public schools, like Arizona’s Anti-LGBTQ Curriculum Law, harm LGBTQ students by
 3 fostering school climates that stigmatize and isolate LGBTQ youth, putting them at
 4 heightened risk of bullying and harassment. In addition, the rate of new HIV/AIDS
 5 diagnoses in Arizona increased significantly from 2011 to 2017, particularly among young
 6 people.

7 4. The Anti-LGBTQ Curriculum Law was enacted in 1991 to express moral
 8 disapproval of “homosexuality” and of non-heterosexual people, and to discriminate against
 9 them. It does not serve any legitimate state purpose.

10 5. Plaintiffs have sustained and will sustain irreparable harm due to the Anti-
 11 LGBTQ Curriculum Law. The Court should declare this law unconstitutional and enjoin its
 12 enforcement.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

14 6. Plaintiffs bring this action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 to redress the deprivation
 15 under color of state law of rights secured by the United States Constitution.

16 7. This Court has subject-matter jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1343.
 17 It may issue a declaratory judgment and grant relief under 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and 2202.

18 8. Venue is proper in this District under 28 U.S.C. § 1331(b) because Defendants
 19 reside in the District of Arizona and the events or omissions giving rise to Plaintiffs’ claims
 20 took place in the District of Arizona. Venue is proper in the Tucson Division because a
 21 substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to Plaintiffs’ claims, including those
 22 of Plaintiff S.C., occurred in Pima County, Arizona.

PARTIES

24 9. Plaintiff Equality Arizona is a nonprofit organization whose purpose is to
 25 secure, protect, and defend the rights and welfare of LGBTQ people in Arizona. It is a
 26 501(c)(3) organization and is incorporated under the laws of the State of Arizona with the
 27 legal name Arizona Human Rights Foundation, which does business as Equality Arizona.

1 Equality Arizona has members throughout the state, and its membership includes LGBTQ
 2 students who attend Arizona public schools.

3 10. Plaintiff S.C. is a twelve-year-old student in seventh grade at a public charter
 4 middle school in Tucson, Arizona. S.C. uses the pronouns “they” and “them” and is a
 5 member of the LGBTQ community. They identify as “queer” and “not heterosexual.” They
 6 previously attended schools in the Tucson Unified School District and plan to attend a
 7 public high school in the Tucson Unified School District beginning in ninth grade. S.C.
 8 lives with their family in Pima County, Arizona. They are a member of Equality Arizona.

9 11. Carol Brochin is S.C.’s mother. She brings this action on behalf of S.C. under
 10 Rule 17(c) as S.C.’s next friend. She is a member of Equality Arizona.

11 12. Defendant Kathy Hoffman is sued in her official capacity as the
 12 Superintendent of Public Instruction. The responsibilities of the Superintendent of Public
 13 Instruction, an elected official, include exercising supervision over the public school system
 14 and serving as a member of the Arizona State Board of Education (“Board of Education”
 15 or “Board”). A.R.S. § 15-203; Ariz. Const. Art. XI, Sections 2, 3. Among other things, the
 16 Board of Education exercises general supervision over and regulates the conduct of the
 17 public school system, adopts rules and policies pertaining to public schools, and enforces
 18 laws relating to schools. A.R.S. § 15-203(A); Ariz. Const. Art. XI, Section 2. The Board
 19 also administers and is the policymaking body of the Arizona Department of Education.
 20 A.R.S. § 15-231(B). The Superintendent of Public Instruction is responsible for the
 21 execution of policies of the Board, and she controls the Arizona Department of Education.
 22 A.R.S. § 15-231.

23 13. Defendant Lucas Narducci is the President of the Board of Education and is
 24 sued in his official capacity.

25 14. Defendant Daniel P. Corr is the Vice President of the Board of Education and is sued
 26 in his official capacity.

27 15. Defendant Calvin Baker is a member of the Board of Education and is sued
 28 in his official capacity.

1 16. Defendant Jill Broussard is a member of the Board of Education and is sued
 2 in her official capacity.

3 17. Defendant Christine Burton is a member of the Board of Education and is
 4 sued in her official capacity.

5 18. Defendant Rita H. Cheng is a member of the Board of Education and is sued
 6 in her official capacity.

7 19. Defendant Michele Kaye is a member of the Board of Education and is sued
 8 in her official capacity.

9 20. Defendant Janice Mak is a member of the Board of Education and is sued in
 10 her official capacity.

11 21. Defendant Armando Ruiz is a member of the Board of Education and is sued
 12 in his official capacity.

13 22. Defendant Patricia Welborn is a member of the Board of Education and is
 14 sued in her official capacity.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Anti-LGBTQ Curriculum Law

17 23. In 1991, the Arizona legislature enacted A.R.S. § 15-716, which regulates the
 18 teaching of HIV/AIDS instruction in district schools. A.R.S. § 15-716(C) states:

19 [N]o district shall include in its course of study instruction which:
 20 1. Promotes a homosexual life-style.
 21 2. Portrays homosexuality as a positive alternative life-style.
 22 3. Suggests that some methods of sex are safe methods of homosexual sex.
 A.R.S. § 15-716(C).

23 24. When the law was approved by the Arizona House of Representatives in
 24 1991, Representative Karen Mills told *The Arizona Daily Star*, “[m]any people today still
 25 believe that homosexuality is not a positive, or even an alternative, lifestyle,” and that “there
 26 are no safe methods of homosexual sex.”

27 25. The State’s discrimination is enshrined both in A.R.S. § 15-716(C)’s
 28 restriction on HIV/AIDS instruction, and in the Board of Education’s earlier regulation

1 requiring that certain sex education materials and instruction “shall . . . [p]romote honor and
 2 respect for monogamous heterosexual marriage,” Ariz. Admin. Code R7-2-303(A)(3)(b)(v)
 3 (“the Regulation”).

4 26. Although Arizona’s local governing boards for school districts are charged
 5 with “[p]rescrib[ing] the curricula and criteria for the promotion and graduation of pupils”
 6 consistent with the State’s minimum requirements, A.R.S. § 15-341(A)(5), they must do so
 7 without violating applicable State statutes and regulations, including the Anti-LGBTQ
 8 Curriculum Law and Regulation.

9 **The Anti-LGBTQ Curriculum Law Harms Plaintiffs**

10 27. The Anti-LGBTQ Curriculum Law harms LGBTQ students. It stigmatizes
 11 them by creating a state-sanctioned climate of discrimination in schools and prevents
 12 LGBTQ students from having educational opportunities equal to those of their heterosexual
 13 peers. Students who are not LGBTQ are not singled out for stigma or prohibited from
 14 learning relevant, medically accurate information necessary to their health and safety.

15 28. The Anti-LGBTQ Curriculum Law communicates to teachers and students
 16 that there is something so undesirable, shameful, or controversial about “homosexuality”
 17 that any positive portrayals of LGBTQ people or same-sex relationships must be explicitly
 18 barred. The enforcement of the statute, and its very existence, demeans LGBTQ students
 19 and denotes their inferiority to heterosexual students. By enshrining into state law that
 20 LGBTQ people may only be discussed in a negative light, the State and Defendants instruct
 21 all students that LGBTQ people are a dangerous, immoral class of people from whom other
 22 students must be shielded. Stigma is associated with lower self-esteem and greater risk-
 23 taking behaviors, and it can have devastating and enduring impacts on LGBTQ youth, who
 24 face dramatically higher risks for suicide, suicidal ideation, and depression compared to
 25 their heterosexual peers. Data from the U.S. Centers for Disease Control indicate that
 26 nationally, 29% of LBG youth had attempted suicide at least once *in the prior year*,
 27 compared to 6% of heterosexual youth.

1 29. The Anti-LGBTQ Curriculum Law permits schools to promote inaccurate
2 stereotypes about LGBTQ people, while forbidding the presentation of medically accurate,
3 age-appropriate information about HIV/AIDS that is critical for the health and safety of
4 LGBTQ students, without imposing any comparable restriction on information about
5 heterosexual people. It prevents LGBTQ students from having equal educational
6 opportunities and exacerbates the heightened risks LGBTQ students already face to their
7 health and safety. CDC data show that LGB youth are disproportionately at risk of HIV,
8 sexually transmitted infections, and teen pregnancy. In Arizona, the rate of new HIV/AIDS
9 diagnoses in Arizona increased significantly from 2011 to 2017, particularly among young
10 people. LGB students in Arizona are three times more likely than students who identify as
11 heterosexual to report being raped.

12 30. The Anti-LGBTQ Curriculum Law also fosters school climates that
13 stigmatize and isolate LGBTQ youth, putting them at heightened risk of bullying and
14 harassment. LGBTQ students in states with laws like Arizona's Anti-LGBTQ Curriculum
15 Law are more likely to report hostile school climates and are less likely to report access to
16 LGBTQ-inclusive school supports.

17 31. Recent data demonstrate that Arizona schools are not safe for most LGBTQ
18 students. Nearly 80% of LGBTQ middle and high school students surveyed regularly heard
19 homophobic remarks at school such as “fag” or “dyke.” In reporting on their experiences *in*
20 *the past year*, 71% of LGBTQ students surveyed in Arizona experienced verbal harassment,
21 30% experienced physical harassment, and 12% were physically assaulted due to their
22 sexual orientation.

23 32. LGBTQ students who lack support and face harassment and discrimination at
24 school experience increased isolation, depression, and risk of suicide and are more likely
25 than their peers to miss school, often in an effort to avoid abuse. These negative experiences
26 can have serious long-term negative impacts on these students' health, education, and well-
27 being.
28

1 33. By contrast, LGBTQ students who attend schools allowing equal and open
 2 discussion about their identities on par with the recognition and discussion of heterosexual
 3 identities are safer and healthier. LGBTQ-inclusive curricula are associated with higher
 4 reports of safety, and lower levels of bullying in schools.

5 34. A positive school climate has been associated with a decrease in depression,
 6 suicidal feelings, substance use, and unexcused school absences among LGBTQ students.
 7 LGBTQ students in a positive school climate also perform better academically and feel a
 8 greater sense of belonging in their school community. The CDC recommends that as part
 9 of a positive school climate, schools should “ensure that health curricula or educational
 10 materials include HIV, other STD, and pregnancy prevention information that is relevant to
 11 LGB youth . . .”

12 35. Defendant Hoffman, in her official capacity as Superintendent of Public
 13 Instruction, has recognized that students “in the LGBTQ community” are “more likely to
 14 experience bullying and harassment,” and that “[a] simple step we can take to help reduce
 15 discrimination and bullying for these students is to repeal the ‘no promo homo’ law [A.R.S.
 16 § 15-716(C)] – legislation that only contributes to an unsafe school environment. This
 17 policy is not just outdated, it has always been harmful and wrong.”

18 36. Notwithstanding this recognition by Defendant Hoffman, repeated legislative
 19 attempts to repeal the Anti-LGBTQ Curriculum Law have failed, and the State and
 20 Defendants continue to enforce the law.

21 37. Through the Anti-LGBTQ Curriculum Law, and Defendants’ enforcement of
 22 it, the State and Defendants discriminate against LGBTQ students and violate their well-
 23 established legal obligations to provide equal educational opportunities to all students,
 24 including students who identify as LGBTQ.

25 **Equality Arizona**

26 38. Equality Arizona is a nonprofit statewide advocacy organization for LGBTQ
 27 people, and it has members throughout the state. The Anti-LGBTQ Curriculum Law inflicts
 28 serious and ongoing harm against Equality Arizona members.

1 39. Equality Arizona brings this action based on associational standing on behalf
 2 of its members. Equality Arizona's members include LGBTQ students who attend, have
 3 attended, or will attend Arizona public schools, including Plaintiff S.C. Because Equality
 4 Arizona seeks only declaratory and injunctive relief, individual participation of Equality
 5 Arizona members is not required.

6 40. Members of Equality Arizona have experienced the harmful effects of the
 7 Anti-LGBTQ Curriculum Law. For example, Equality Arizona member A.A.² is a fifteen-
 8 year old gay student in ninth grade at a public high school in the greater Phoenix area. A.A.
 9 has experienced the harmful effects of the Law and continues to be harmed by it.

10 41. Although A.A. was not open about his sexual orientation when he was in
 11 middle school, he experienced bullying and verbal harassment based on his perceived
 12 sexual orientation. Other students repeatedly called him "fag" and used other homophobic
 13 slurs, such as calling him "gay" in a derogatory way.

14 42. When he was in sixth grade, an incident of name calling made A.A. so upset
 15 that he began to cry at school. He sought help from the school counselor, who told him to
 16 leave and sent him back to class while he was still crying.

17 43. A.A. came out as gay to family members and friends the summer before he
 18 began ninth grade.

19 44. A.A. is a member of his high school's Gay Straight Alliance club, and he was
 20 elected president of the club for the 2019-2020 year. In the fall of 2018, A.A. was elected
 21 to his school's homecoming court, which made him visible in the larger school community
 22 as a gay student.

23 45. After homecoming, A.A. began to experience bullying and harassment based
 24 on his sexual orientation and for being perceived as insufficiently "masculine" by other
 25 boys, which is a stereotype associated with gay males. For example, when he uses the locker
 26 room to change clothes for physical education class, other boys frequently taunt him for

27

28

² To preserve privacy, the Complaint uses the pseudonym A.A.

1 being gay, and A.A. has had clothes and other objects thrown at him in the locker room.
 2 A.A. is not able to avoid using the locker room, as he is required to change his clothes for
 3 physical education class.

4 46. At school, A.A. is enrolled in a weekly health class, which is part of physical
 5 education and is required for graduation. Boys and girls are taught health separately. The
 6 same boys who harass A.A. in the locker room during physical education are also in his
 7 health course. In March 2019, A.A.’s health class began a unit of sex education, which A.A.
 8 believes will include HIV/AIDS instruction.

9 47. A.A. has heard from older students who have previously taken this class that
 10 when students have asked about safe sex for gay people, the teachers avoid answering,
 11 saying “we can’t really talk about that” or ignoring the questions. A.A. is afraid to ask
 12 questions relevant to LGBTQ people for fear that his questions will lead to further
 13 harassment and bullying from his peers.

14 48. The written policies of A.A.’s school district on “family life” education,
 15 which includes instruction in sex education and HIV/AIDS instruction, explicitly
 16 incorporate the Anti-LGBTQ Curriculum Law and Regulation.

17 49. A.A. is worried that he will not be able to learn medically accurate
 18 information in school, including in his health class, that will keep him safe and healthy.

19 50. A.A. believes that if teachers were permitted to discuss LGBTQ people on
 20 the same terms as heterosexual people, including during sex education and HIV/AIDS
 21 instruction, other students at his school would realize that being LGBTQ is something that
 22 is acceptable to talk about, and not a source of shame or ridicule. A.A. believes that it would
 23 be easier for him to feel safe in school, including in the locker room, if his teachers were
 24 not restricted by the Anti-LGBTQ Curriculum Law.

25 51. A.A. would like to advocate within his school district for an LGBTQ-
 26 inclusive HIV/AIDS curriculum, but the Anti-LGBTQ Curriculum Law makes such
 27 advocacy futile.

1 **Plaintiff S.C.**

2 52. Plaintiff S.C. is a twelve-year-old student in seventh grade at a public charter
 3 middle school in Tucson, Arizona. They identify as “queer” and “not heterosexual.”

4 53. When their family moved to Tucson in 2014, S.C. and their brother, who is
 5 one grade older than S.C., began attending a public elementary school in the Tucson Unified
 6 School District (“TUSD”). S.C. learned about the Anti-LGBTQ Curriculum Law in fourth
 7 grade, when their brother was taking the “family life” curriculum, and told S.C. and their
 8 mom they were not allowed to talk about “homosexuality” in the class. At the time, S.C.
 9 was beginning to understand their sexual orientation, and learning about the law made them
 10 feel less accepted by their school.

11 54. S.C. took the elementary school family life curriculum, which did not include
 12 any mention of LGBTQ people in discussions of relationships, family structures, behaviors,
 13 and HIV/AIDS prevention.

14 55. The materials provided to teachers and parents about TUSD’s elementary
 15 school family life curriculum contain the “Arizona Guidelines for Sex Education,” which
 16 explicitly incorporate the Anti-LGBTQ Curriculum Law and Regulation.

17 56. In sixth grade, S.C. began middle school at a public middle school in TUSD.
 18 They experienced bullying from classmates because of their perceived sexual orientation.
 19 For example, S.C. was repeatedly called a “stupid gay kid” and “faggot” by other students.
 20 S.C. was not supported by teachers or administrators when they shared what had been
 21 happening to them, and did not feel safe at the school as an LGBTQ person. S.C. frequently
 22 went to the school nurse’s office because they were so upset from the harassment and
 23 bullying.

24 57. As a result of the harassment and bullying S.C. experienced, S.C. and their
 25 brother transferred to a public charter middle school in October of S.C.’s sixth grade year.

26 58. For ninth grade, S.C. plans to attend Tucson High Magnet School, a public
 27 high school in TUSD.

1 59. At Tucson High Magnet School, S.C. will be required to take a health
 2 education course to graduate.

3 60. The materials provided to teachers and parents about TUSD's high school
 4 family life curriculum, which includes sex education, state that HIV/AIDS instruction will
 5 be taught separately "using the State recommended curricula." These materials contain the
 6 "Arizona Guidelines for Sex Education," which explicitly incorporate the Anti-LGBTQ
 7 Curriculum Law and Regulation.

8 61. Because they will take curriculum subject to the Anti-LGBTQ Curriculum
 9 Law in high school, S.C. will face further stigma and will be denied equal educational
 10 opportunities because of the Law.

CLAIM FOR RELIEF

U.S. Constitution Amendment XIV, 42 U.S.C. § 1983

Denial of Equal Protection on the Basis of Sexual Orientation

14 62. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference and reallege the allegations in paragraphs
 15 1 to 61 as though fully set forth here.

16 63. Plaintiffs state this claim against Defendants in their official capacities for
 17 purposes of seeking declaratory and injunctive relief. At all relevant times, Defendants have
 18 acted and continue to act under color of state law.

19 64. The Fourteenth Amendment provides that "[n]o state shall . . . deny to any
 20 person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."

21 65. A.R.S. § 15-716(C) and Ariz. Admin. Code R7-2-303(A)(3)(b)(v) violate the
 22 Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution by
 23 discriminating against non-heterosexual students, both facially and as applied.

24 66. Despite Defendant Hoffman's recognition of the harms that the Anti-LGBTQ
 25 Curriculum Law imposes on LGBTQ students, Defendants continue to enforce the Law and
 26 Regulation.

27 67. The Anti-LGBTQ Curriculum Law and Regulation single out non-
 28 heterosexual students for differential and adverse treatment on the basis of their sexual

1 orientation. The law prohibits positive discussion of “homosexuality” in HIV/AIDS
2 instruction without imposing any similar restriction on discussion of heterosexuality or
3 heterosexual people. The Regulation requires that instruction on sexual intercourse
4 “shall . . . [p]romote honor and respect for monogamous heterosexual marriage,” but does
5 not require instruction that promotes honor or respect for monogamous same-sex marriage.
6 The Law and Regulation stigmatize LGBTQ students, encourage teachers and classmates
7 to view them as inferior, harm their long-term health and well-being, and deny them equal
8 educational opportunities on the basis of their sexual orientation.

9 68. The Anti-LGBTQ Curriculum Law also singles out non-heterosexual students
10 for differential and adverse treatment on the basis of their sexual orientation by prohibiting
11 presentation of medically accurate information about “homosexual sex” and
12 “homosexuality” during HIV/AIDS instruction, even when such information serves
13 important educational purposes, while imposing no similar restrictions on discussion of
14 heterosexuality or heterosexual people. This also stigmatizes LGBTQ students and harms
15 their long-term health and well-being, including by denying them equal educational
16 opportunities to potentially lifesaving information about HIV/AIDS prevention on the basis
17 of their sexual orientation.

18 69. The Anti-LGBTQ Curriculum Law and Regulation have contributed to the
19 creation of an anti-LGBTQ climate in many Arizona public schools. They foster a culture
20 of silence and non-acceptance of LGBTQ students and discourage school officials from
21 complying with their obligations to treat all students equally, without regard to sexual
22 orientation.

23 70. The Anti-LGBTQ Curriculum Law and Regulation do not serve any
24 legitimate purpose, pedagogical or otherwise, and are instead rooted in animus toward and
25 moral disapproval of LGBTQ people.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

27 WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs respectfully request that this Court enter judgment as
28 follows:

- 1 A. Declaring that A.R.S. § 15-716(C) and Ariz. Admin. Code R7-2-
 2 303(A)(3)(b)(v) violate the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to the
 3 United States Constitution;
- 4 B. Permanently enjoining Defendants and their agents, officers, employees,
 5 successors, and all persons acting in concert with each or any of them from enforcing A.R.S.
 6 § 15-716(C) and Ariz. Admin. Code R7-2-303(A)(3)(b)(v);
- 7 C. Awarding Plaintiffs the costs incurred in pursuing this action, including
 8 reasonable attorneys' fees under 42 U.S.C. § 1988 and other applicable laws; and
- 9 D. Granting such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

10 Dated: March 28, 2019

PERKINS COIE LLP

11 By: /s/ Daniel C. Barr

12 Daniel C. Barr (#010149)
 13 Barry G. Stratford (#029923)
 14 Randal B. McDonald (#032008)
 15 Katherine E. May (#032335)
 16 2901 North Central Avenue, Suite 2000
 17 Phoenix, AZ 85012-2788
 18 **NATIONAL CENTER FOR**
 19 **LESBIAN RIGHTS**
 20 Julie Wilensky*
 21 Asaf Orr*
 22 870 Market Street, Suite 370
 23 San Francisco, CA 94102

24
 25
 26
 27
 28 **LAMBDA LEGAL DEFENSE AND**
 19 **EDUCATION FUND, INC.**
 20 Puneet Cheema*
 21 1776 K Street N.W., Suite 722
 22 Washington, DC 20006

23
 24
 25
 26
 27
 28 **LAMBDA LEGAL DEFENSE AND**
 22 **EDUCATION FUND, INC.**
 23 Peter C. Renn*
 24 4221 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 280
 25 Los Angeles, CA 90010

26
 27
 28 Clifford Rosky*
 25 383 South University Street
 26 Salt Lake City, UT 84112

26
 27
 28 *Attorneys for Plaintiffs*

26
 27
 28 **Pro hac vice application forthcoming*

99999-0453/143865648.1

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

Civil Cover Sheet

This automated JS-44 conforms generally to the manual JS-44 approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974. The data is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. The information contained herein neither replaces nor supplements the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law. This form is authorized for use only in the District of Arizona.

The completed cover sheet must be printed directly to PDF and filed as an attachment to the Complaint or Notice of Removal.

Plaintiff Equality Arizona ; Carol
(s): Brochin

Defendant Arizona State Board of
(s): Education; Jill
Broussard , Member of
the Arizona State Board
of Education; Christine
Burton , Member of the
Arizona State Board of
Education; Rita H.
Cheng , Member of the
Arizona State Board of
Education; Michele
Kaye , Member of the
Arizona State Board of
Education; Janice Mak ,

Member of the Arizona State Board of Education; Armando Ruiz , Member of the Arizona State Board of Education; Patricia Welborn , Member of the Arizona State Board of Education

County of Residence: Maricopa
County Where Claim For Relief
Arose: Pima

Plaintiff's Atty(s):
**Daniel C. Barr (Equality Arizona ; Carol Brochin)
Perkins Coie LLP
2901 North Central Avenue, Suite 2000
Phoenix, Arizona 85012
602-351-8000**

County of Residence: Maricopa

Defendant's Atty(s):

**Barry G. Stratford
Perkins Coie LLP
2901 North Central Avenue, Suite 2000
Phoenix, Arizona 85012
602-351-8000**

**Randal B. McDonald (Equality Arizona ; Carol Brochin)
Perkins Coie LLP
2901 North Central Avenue, Suite 2000
Phoenix, Arizona 85012
602-351-8000**

Katherine E. May (Equality Arizona ; Carol Brochin)
Perkins Coie LLP
2901 North Central Avenue, Suite 2000
Phoenix, Arizona 85012
602-351-8000

Julie Wilensky (Equality Arizona ; Carol Brochin)
National Center for Lesbian Rights
870 Market Street, Suite 370
San Francisco, California 94102
415-392-6257

Asaf Orr (Equality Arizona ; Carol Brochin)
National Center for Lesbian Rights
870 Market Street, Suite 370
San Francisco, California 94102
415-392-6257

Puneet Cheema (Equality Arizona ; Carol Brochin)
Lambda Legal Defense and Education Fund, Inc.
1776 K Street N.W., Suite 722
Washington, DC 20006
202-492-7948

Peter C. Renn (Equality Arizona ; Carol Brochin)
Lambda Legal Defense and Education Fund, Inc.
4221 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 280
Los Angeles, California 90010
213-382-7600

Clifford Rosky (Equality Arizona ;

Carol Brochin)

University of Utah Law School

383 South University Street

Salt Lake City, Utah 84112

801-581-7352

II. Basis of

Jurisdiction:

3. Federal Question (U.S. not a party)

III. Citizenship of

Principal Parties

(Diversity Cases Only)

Plaintiff:- N/A

Defendant:- N/A

IV. Origin :

1. Original Proceeding

V. Nature of Suit:

950 Constitutionality of State Statute

VI.Cause of Action:

Plaintiffs bring this action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 to redress the deprivation under state law of rights secured by the U.S. Constitution.

VII. Requested in Complaint

Class Action: No

Dollar Demand:

Jury Demand: No

VIII. This case is not related to another case.

Signature: /s/ Daniel C. Barr

Date: 3/28/2019

If any of this information is incorrect, please go back to the Civil Cover Sheet Input form using the *Back* button in your browser and change it. Once correct, save this form as a PDF and include it as an attachment to your case opening documents.

